



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

X. — *Victorius and Codex Γ of Aristophanes.*

BY DR. EARNEST CARY,

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THOSE who have occasion to consult frequently the scholia to Aristophanes in the editions of Dindorf and Dübner will be familiar with the abbreviation *Vict.* attached to numerous glosses in that collection. These glosses were excerpted from the notes which the Italian scholar Petrus Victorius (Piero Vettori) entered in his copy of the Aldine Aristophanes, now preserved in Munich. Besides the glosses quoted by Dindorf, the notes consist of numerous other glosses, clearly derived from the lexicographers, together with a few corrections in the scholia and a large number of textual variants. The entire collection was published in the *Acta Philologorum Monacensium*, Vol. I (1812), by Nickel, a member of Thiersch's seminary. Nickel called attention to the fact that Victorius had occasionally employed one or more symbols in connection with a reading, in order apparently to distinguish his Ms sources.¹ One of the Mss, moreover, is briefly described by Victorius in a note at the close of the *Aves*: "Sic distincta sunt haec carmina in vet. cod. ex bibliotheca Divi Marci, cum quo totam comoediam contulimus."² It was this statement in particular which challenged my attention recently while engaged in investigating the manuscript tradition of the *Aves* and of the *Acharnenses*; and it is this "vetustus codex ex bibliotheca Divi Marci" which forms the subject of the present inquiry. For the opportunity to undertake this investigation, as well as the larger problem out of which it grew, I gratefully acknowledge

¹ The only instances of the use of symbols cited by Nickel are the following: *b*, *Nub.* 1109, 1116, 1230; *n*, *Nub.* 1104, 1109; *v* and *c*, *Vesp.* 615, 936. According to Mr. Walter H. Freeman, who was good enough to verify for me a few of Nickel's statements while studying in Munich last year, there are no other occurrences of these symbols. The various terms used by Nickel, such as *Vict.*, *Vict. cod.*, *Gl.*, etc., are thus seen to represent no distinctions made by Victorius himself.

² Cf. the entries, "in vetusto cod. legi ἀναπλάσειν," etc. (*Nub.* 993), and "στίχος ἄλλως ἐν παλαιῷ ἀντιγράφῳ" (*Nub.* 1510).

my indebtedness to Professor John Williams White, who kindly placed at my disposal for the purpose his complete collections of facsimiles of the Mss containing the *Aves* and the *Acharnenses*.¹

Victorius states that he had consulted his early Ms throughout the whole of the *Aves*. My problem, then, has been to discover some one among our earlier Mss which should offer all or virtually all the readings of the *Aves* excerpted by Victorius, and which should follow his principle of verse-division in the choral passage at the end of the play (vs. 1748-54). I find such a Ms in Cod. Γ (Laurentianus 31, 15 + Vossianus Leidensis 52; verses 1-1419 are preserved in the Laurentianus, 1492-1765 in the Vossianus). It will be more convenient to treat the two parts of Γ as a single Ms; but the point at which the Vossianus begins will be indicated in each list by a new paragraph. The evidence for my identification follows.

Aves. — *Textual variants found in Γ only.*² — (a) 48 'πέπτατο] πέπτατο RVUM8E, πέπταται AhAld., πέπταται B 566 καθαγιάζειν]

¹ The valuable service photographic facsimiles of Mss may render to the student of the classics is sufficiently attested by the increasing demand for such reproduction of Mss either in whole or in part. The many scholars who desire from time to time facsimiles of limited portions of a Ms will be particularly interested in a very practical suggestion recently put forward by Professor White. In the course of an address delivered before the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, on the occasion of the celebration of its twenty-fifth anniversary in 1904, he suggested that the Society would seem admirably fitted to act as a medium for the securing of such facsimiles (see *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXIV, 1904, lxvii-lxix). The Society voted to establish a bureau for this purpose.

² In the lists which follow, the reading before the bracket is that of Victorius and Γ. In citing the readings of the other Mss I avail myself of the symbols suggested by Professor White in *Classical Philology*, I (1906), 9 ff. These are, for the *Aves*: Ravennas (R), Venetus 474 (V), Venetus 475 (G), Parisinus 2712 (A), Parisinus 2715 (B), Parisinus 2717 (C), Vaticano-Urbinas 141 (U), Vaticano-Palatinus 67 (Vp2), Ambrosianus L 39 sup. (M8), Ambrosianus L 41 sup. (M9), Estensis III D 8 (E), Estensis III D 14 (E2), Havniensis 1980 (H), Laurentianus 31, 16 (Δ). G, M9, E2, and Δ are copies of V, E, M9, and B respectively (for the last three see *Harvard Studies in Classical Philol.* XVIII, 1907, pp. 166 f., 175 ff.), and will be ignored therefore in the following lists except in the event of divergence from the parent Mss; yet on vs. 222-601, now lost in E, I quote M9. In the *Aves* C, Vp2, and H represent in all important readings

καταγίζειν RVAM8hAld., καθαγίζειν UM9B 906 ἀρδαῖς] ἀοιδαῖς RVU, ὠδαῖς AM8EhAld.

(δ) 1748 φάνος¹] φάος RVAUM8EhAld.

*Textual variants found in Γ and other Mss.*² — (α) 18 τήνδε δι (τηνδεδι B)] τήν δι δε U, τήνδε δε hAld. 48 εἶδε] οἶδε AM9hAld. 166 ἀτιμον] ἀντιμον hAld. 230 ἀγροίκων (B²)] ἀγρῶν hAld. 241 ἀοιδάν (B²)] αὐδάν RAUhAld. 245 κάπτετε Vict., κάπτεθ' Γ] κάπτεσθ' A, κάμπτεθ' hAld. 318 ἀφίχθον] ἀφίχθον'θ' R, ἀφίχθον θ' M8, ἀφίκονθ' VhAld., ἀφίχθαι A 357 μένοντε] μέν τε Ald. 411 ὄρνιθας] ὄρνιτας Vp2C, ὄρνις Ald. 560 ψωλήν] κωλήν. hAld. 564 ὄσ'] ὄς AM8M9h, δ Ald. 566 οἶν] οἶνον A, οἶν M8, ὕν hAld. 589 εἰς (V)] εἰς V²AM8hAld. 600 ἴσασι] οἴσασι Vp2C, οἶδασι HAld. 607 παιδάριον ὄντ'³] παιδάρι' εἴτ' ὄντ' RV, παῖδριον (?) A, παιδάριον M8, παιδάριόν τ' EhAld., παιδάριον ὄν B 648 δεῖνα δεῦρ'] δεῖν' hAld. 763 φρυγίλος] φρεγίλος Ald. 853-54 σεμνὰ σεμνὰ (B²)] σεμνὰ RVAM8EhAld. 857 ἴτω ἴτω ἴτω] ἴτω ἴτω UAld. 887 μεγαγκορύφω] μελαγκορύφω RVAM8EhAld. 894 τουτονί] τουτογι RVAM8EhAld. 906 τεαῖσιν] τεαῖς RVAM8EhAld. 943 ὑφαντοδόνητον (V²)] ὑφαντοδόνατον V, ὑφαντοδίναντον G, ὑφαντοδίνητον AhAld. 944 ἀκλεῆς] ἄλλεῆς Ald. 945 ὃ τοι] ὅ,τι UhAld. 952 πολύπυρα] πολύσπορα RhAld., πολύπορα VAI²M8E 959 εὐφημί' ἔστω] εὐφημία' ὅστω RV²EALD., εὐφημιάσθω G, εὐφημί' ἄστω A, εὐφημί' ὅστω M8, om. vs. V 968 Σικυῶνος] σικυῶνον Ald. 1085 ὕμῶν] ἡμῶν hAld. 1187 παῖε] πᾶς RAM8, πᾶς τις EhAld. 1197 γρ. μεταρσίον Vict., μεταρσίον in text ΓU] πεδαρσίον RVAM8EhAld., γρ. πεδαρσίον (from περδασίου) Γ 1377 τε νᾶν] γενεὰν hAld. 1381 λιγύφθογος (B²)] λιγύμυθος M8hAld., λιγύμοχθος B² (as alternative reading) 1396 πνοαῖσι] πνοαιῖσι hAld., πνοαιῖσιν B.

(δ) 1566 ὀράν] ὀράς Ald. 1671 αἰκίαν] αἰτίαν AVp2HAld.⁴ 1684 γρ. καὶ συμβήσομαι Vict.Γ², συμβήσομαι (ξυμ- E) in text VE

but a single tradition, which may be designated as *h*. I add in every case the Aldine reading corrected by Victorius. The verses are cited according to the numbering of Brunck, not that of Invernizzi and Nickel.

¹ This (the reading of Cod. Voss.), and not *φέγγος*, is the entry of Victorius, according to Mr. Freeman.

² In this and similar lists the Mss whose symbols do not appear after the bracket are to be understood as offering the same reading as Γ and Victorius; but G, M9, E2 and Δ are treated according to the principle announced just above (p. 200, n. 2). Slight differences of accent, etc., are ignored.

³ Following these words Nickel attributes to Victorius *ἀποθνήσκουσι*, but according to Mr. Freeman there is no departure from the Aldine.

⁴ The folios of M8 containing vs. 1642-1765 of the *Aves* have been lost.

(B²)] *σιγήσομαι* RAFU^hBald. 1750 *ὦ χθόνιαι* (B²)] om. Bald. 1753 *ἔχει*] *ἔχειν* Bald., om. E2.

Textual variants not in Γ but in other Mss.—Perhaps 1748 *ἀστραπῆς* Vict.E2] *ἀστεροπῆς* RVAUE^hB; although this may well be a gloss.¹

*Assignments of verses common to Γ and other Mss.*²—(a) 643^b ΠΕΙ.] : RV, om. GUM8E^hAld. 646^a ΟΙ ΔΥΟ (as part of vs. in U)] om. RVA, — M8, ΠΕΙ. E^hBald. 647^a ΟΙ ΔΥΟ (as part of vs. in U)] — RVM8, ΠΕΙ. GAE^hBald. 803^a ΕΥ.] om. UAld. 817^b ΕΥ.] sp. RU, om. V, — M8, ΕΠ. E^hAld. 889 ΠΕΙ.] om. UAld. 904 ΠΟΙ. (G)] om. VU, ΠΕΙ. Ald. 946 ΠΕΙ.] — R, om. VU, ΠΟΙ. Ald. 1253 IP. *τί*; ΠΕΙ.] *τί* RA^hBald., — *τί* V, sp. *τί* sp. GU, — *τί* — M8 1329 KHP.] — RVM8, om. GU^h, XO. A, ΠΕΙ. Ald. 1387 KIN.] — RVM8, om. GU^hAld., ΔΙΘ. *h*.

(b) 1616 ΠΕΙ. (G)] — RV, HP. AM8, om. UBald.³

The verse-division indicated by Victorius in *Av*. 1748–1754 is the same as that of ΓRVE, and differs from that of Invernizzi only in attaching *καὶ* to 1753. B divides as in the Aldine, and so, essentially, Vp2HC; A, U, and G show various irregularities; M8 fails.

It thus appears that virtually every correction to the text of the *Av*es entered by Victorius could have been taken from the appropriate part of Γ, so far as the folios of that Ms now preserved in Florence and Leiden enable us to determine. We are therefore justified in assuming that the reading *μένουσί τ'*, given by Victorius on vs. 1446, where all the other Mss read *λόγοισί τ'*, was either the actual reading of Γ, in the folio now lost, or at least Victorius' interpretation of what he found there.⁴

The evidence of the glosses points even more emphatically to Γ as the only Ms which could have furnished Victorius the greater part of his notes. Thus we have:

Glosses found in Γ only.—(a) 231 *γένη* (τὰ *γένη* Γ) 233 *φωνήν*

¹ Cf. 645 *Κριῶθεν* Vict.RV] *κριῶθεν* GE, *θριῶθεν* AM8, *θριῶθεν* Γ, *θριῶθεν* ^{κ ῆ} *h*Ald, *θριῶθεν* B; but *γρ. καὶ κριῶθεν* is read in the scholium of Γ.

² The symbols — and : will be readily understood as the customary indications of change of speaker before and in the middle of the verse respectively.

³ Nickel states that ΔΓΓ. was supplied by Vict. before 1706; but this assignment was correctly made in the Aldine.

⁴ For evidence of carelessness on the part of Victorius see below (p. 214, n. 4).

276 τῷ (ὁ ἐν τῷ Γ) ὄρει βαίνων 285 πολλὸν ἔχων (ξ. π. Γ) ὄλβον
 416 ἥγουν ἀνεπίδεκτα τῇ ἀκοῇ· ἔστι δὲ καὶ συμφορὰ πέρα τοῦ κλύειν
 685 ἀσθενεῖς, ἥγουν (ῆ. οἱ Γ) ἀμαυρὸν βίον ἔχοντες καὶ ἀσθενῇ 772
 ἐβόων 778 ἄλλως· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡσύχασεν ἡ θάλασσα κυμαίνουσα κατακηρου-
 μένη (κατακηλουμένη Γ)¹ 782 αἱ κατοικοῦσαι ἐν τῷ Ὀλύμπῳ 798 ὄρνεον
 μικρόν· πυτίνη δὲ πλέγμα ἐστὶν οὕτω πολυπράγμον² 957 ἀκούσαι³
 1013 ἀπελαύνονται 1016 συντρίβειν 1072 καὶ λέγεται καὶ ἀνακηρύτ-
 τεται 1076 κηρύξει καὶ ἀναγορεύσαι 1137 ἥγουν προσήκοντας θεμελίῳ
 1189 λεκτός 1198 ταῖς (ἥγουν ταῖς Γ) δ'·ναις καὶ ταῖς συστροφαῖς 1232
 ἥγουν ἐπάνω 1268 ἐνθάδε 1273 σιγῇ (ἥγουν σιγῇ Γ) πρόσταξον
 1379 χωλόν 1383 ἐπειρμένος, ὑψωθείς 1396 εἶθι ἀναβήσαιμι (καὶ?
 εἶθε ἀναβήσομαι Γ) 1398 βαδίζων 1399 τὸ ἐμόν.

(δ) 1494 ἥγουν δέδοικα (δ. δηλ Γ) 1506 μέλλεις διαφθερεῖν (ἥγουν·
 μέλλει δ. Γ)⁴ 1570 προάγεις 1582 ἐπίτριβε (σύντριβε ἐπίβαλλε Γ)
 1603 ἀρεστά (ἥγουν ἀ. Γ) φαίνονται 1609 ψευδῶς (ἥγουν ψ. Γ) ὁμνύουσιν·
 ὑμᾶς 1623 ἀντὶ τοῦ λουόμενος 1625 ἀνάξει 1641 ἄθλιε 1646 ἐξα-
 πατᾷ 1649 μικρόν, ὀλίγον and μετουσία ὑπάρχει 1654 καὶ ταῦτα
 1657 συνεπειθῇ (ἀναπείθει Γ) 1661 μετοχὴν καὶ κοινωνίαν τῆς οὐσίας
 1671 ἥγουν (καὶ Γ) μᾶστιγα, ἥγουν ἀφορῶν αἰκίσαι καὶ μαστίξαι τινά
 1684 γρ. καὶ συμβήσομαι 1713 δυνατὸν λέγειν 1715 ἄρρητος 1718
 ὁ καπνός 1740 συνακόλουθος 1747 λευκόν, διάπυρον.⁵

Three glosses occur only in Γ and U: 1385 λέξεις 1613 τύπτων
 (τυπ U) 1619 ὑποσχεθεῖς; cf. 1692 πορεύῃ Vict.Γ, πορευθεῖς U.
 One is found in Γ and M8 only: 774 ἐν δὲ τοῖς ποταμοῖς ποιοῦνται τὰς
 διατριβὰς οἱ ὄρνιθες (ὄρνεις? Γ, ὄρνις M8).

*Glosses found in Γ and other Mss.*⁶—(a) 210 γρ. ἄσον Vict.] γρ.
 λῦσον καὶ ἄσον ΓVE, ἀντὶ τοῦ αἶσον R, ἄσον U, γράφεται καὶ λῦσον M8,
 χῦσον καὶ ἄσον M9 793 ἀντὶ τοῦ μοιχὸς ὅστις ἐστὶν ὑμῶν] ἀ. τ. μ. ὁ. ὦν·
 ὑ. ΓE, ἀ. τ. μ. ὁ. ἂν ὑ. RV, ὁ. μ. ὦν ἡμῶν M9, om. UM8 1059 ἐρμηνεύει

¹ This is part of a marginal scholium in Γ.

² Another marginal scholium; there are also interlinear glosses by Γ²:
 (1) ὄρνεον μικρόν, (2) πυτίνη πλέγμα ἐστίν, (3) οὗτος πολυπράγμων, in which
 form the notes appear also in E.

³ The remaining words of Victorius' note, πέπυσμαι, ἀκήκοα, ἔμαθον, ἴδον,
 are from Hesychius. This is but one of several instances where a gloss from
 Hesychius has been combined with that found in the Ms of the *Aves*.

⁴ In the text Γ reads ὀλέσει, the Aldine ὀλέσεις.

⁵ Cf. καταπληκτικόν· τὸν διάπυρον καὶ λευκόν U; the words τὸν λαμπρόν ἢ
 ταχύ, which Victorius adds, are from Hesychius.

⁶ The Mss containing scholia and glosses are R, V, G, Γ, U, M8, E, M9; also
 E2 and C (very rare). The last two Mss are ignored in the present list, while G
 and M9 are quoted only when differing from their archetypes.

τὸ παντόπτα] om. VUM8 1118 τὰ ἐν τοῖς θύμασι σύμβολα] τ. ἐ. τ. θυμά-
μασι σ. E, om. VM8 1169 τρέχει] εἰστρέχει RV, om. GM8E 1245
ἐκφοβεῖν καὶ (εἰς Γ) φόβον ἐμβάλλειν] ἐκφοβεῖν RVU, om. M8E
1254 συνουσιᾶσω ὡς ἐπὶ κόρης] ἀντὶ τοῦ συνουσιᾶσω R, om. VUE
1335 ἀνέξομαι] ἀ. ὑπομείνω U, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀ. E, om. M8 1365 ξίφος ἢ
δόρυ αὐτῷ χειρὶ διδωσι] χειρὶ¹ Γ, ξ. ἢ δ. αὐ. δ. Γ²V, om. RUM8E
1377 τὴν τῶν ὀρνίθων δῆλον· ἐπίτηδες δὲ ὡς ἀσαφῆ αὐτὸν διασύρει]
τ. τ. δ. R, τ. τ. δ. ἐ. αὐτὸν ὦ. ἀ. αὐ. δ. (*sic*) M9, om. VUM8.

(b) 1624 ἵνα καὶ ἀρπάσῃ ἵκτινος ἱμάτιον] ἵνα καὶ ἀρπάσῃ ἱμάτιον ἵκτινος
Γ, ἱμάτιόν τι ἀ. ὁ ἱ. M8, ἱ. κ. ἱ. ἀ. ἱ. E, om. RVUM9 1681 εἰ μὴ ὀρ-
νιθιάζειν²] εἰ μὴ ὀρνιθιάζει RV (as end of schol.), om. UE 1691 λαιμαρ-
γίαν (Γ), συναμωρίαν καὶ λιχνότητα (Γ²)] συναμωρίαν κ. λιχνότητα RV,
λαιμαργίαν U, om. GE 1701 οὗτοι βάρβαροι κωμωδοῦνται] οὐ. ὡς β. κ.
R, om. VU 1706 ἃ μὴ δὲ λόγος ἰσχύσει φράσαι] ἃ μ. δ. λ. ἰσχύει φ. R,
ἃ μ. δ. λόγος ἰσχύει φ. U, ἃ μ. δ. λ. ἰσχύσαι φ. M9, om. V 1731
καλῶς τὸ ἐπιθαλάμιον γέγραπται] om. UE 1759 πρὸς τὴν βασιλείαν]
ὦ βασιλλ U.

Corrections of scholia derivable from Γ and other Mss. — 515, 10
(Dübner) ἀνὰ σκήπτρα (σκήπτρα ΓΓ)] ανασκαπτρω V, ἀνὰ σκήπτρω
M8, ανασκήπτρω M9, ασκήπτρω Ald., om. RU 515, 11 καὶ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς·
ὁ σκηπτροβάμων³ αἰετὸς, κύων Διός] κ. Σ. ὁ σ. αἰ. κ. Δ. V, κ. Σ. ὁ σ.
αἰετὸς G, om. RUM8M9Ald. 806, 19 ἀποκεκαρμένῳ] ἀποκεκαρμένων
(scholium recast) M8, ἀποκεκομμένῳ Ald., om. U 807, 31 ἐπειδὴ εἶδεν]
ἐπειδὴ εἰ δὲ Ald., om. UM8M9 1074, 31 πλαγίζονται⁴] πλαγιάζονται
RVE, πλασιάζονται Ald., om. UM8M9 1604, 28 αὐτὸν] αὐτῷ RM8Ald.,
om. U.

Glosses suggesting the use of another Ms than Γ. — 768 ἡγουν
ἐκφυγεῖν Vict., ἐκφυγεῖν M8 (in scholium)] ἀντὶ τοῦ φυγεῖν (in
scholium) ΓRVEAld., αναφυγεῖν (as gloss) E 1619 ἐξαπατᾷ Vict.,
Vp2C (as part of text)] ἀπατᾷ ΓU. As regards the first, in explana-
tion of ἐκπερδικῆσαι, nothing would have been simpler than the change
of φυγεῖν to ἐκφυγεῖν. In the second instance ἐξαπατᾷ may well be
due likewise to deliberate change; moreover the form ἐξαπατᾷ occurs
just below (1646) in Γ.

¹ χειρὶ was written by the first glossator over θ' ἡτέρα, after which Γ² wrote the
longer gloss before and after χειρὶ in such a manner that the whole appears to
be a single note.

² In Γ this appears in the guise of a variant to εἰ μὴ βαδίζειν, and it was evi-
dently so understood by Victorius.

³ So according to Mr. Freeman.

⁴ This was evidently meant by Victorius as a correction of πλασιάζονται, not
as the missing word of the lacuna. The lacuna is indicated in RVΓ.

All the other glosses are traceable to Hesychius or Suidas, with one or two exceptions. 189 Πυθὼ ἡ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος πόλις. Πυθοῖ ἐν ἡγαθέῃ suggests Eustathius 274, 18; 498 βλῖττειν κυρίως τὸ ἐκπιέζειν τὸ μέλι is probably excerpted from Suidas s.v. βλῖττειν.¹ Two others, 1424 πράγματα ἐρευνῶν καὶ ζητῶν and 1435 κατασκευάζειν δίκας, are to be found in no Ms or lexicographer, and may reasonably be assigned to the lost folio of Γ.

The *Aves* is the only play which Victorius claimed to have corrected with the aid of the Ms which we have just seen reason for identifying with Γ; but it would have been strange indeed if with this early Ms of seven plays at his command he had made no further use of it. And, as a matter of fact, I have discovered good evidence of its use elsewhere, particularly in the case of the *Acharnenses* and the *Vespae*.

Acharnenses. — In this play the argument is by no means so strong as in the *Aves*, for two reasons. In the first place, several of the Mss² here represent essentially the same tradition as Γ; and secondly, the glosses of Γ are far less numerous than in the *Aves*.

Textual variants definitely indicating Γ as source. — There is but one variant of Victorius to be found in Γ alone: 910 ἐμὸ Γ²] ἐμά (Γ). Another occurs only in Γ and its copy Vb1: 638 διὰ τῶν στεφάνων ΓVb1] διὰ τοὺς στεφάνους (Γ², Vb1 cor.). The error of Victorius in inserting 1107 after 1097, afterwards corrected, points directly to Γ, or possibly to B. In Γ, 1097, 1107, and 1119, all originally omitted, were added by Γ² at the top of the page; as

¹ The long note on 1378 is expressly assigned to Athenaeus by Victorius himself.

² The *Acharnenses* is contained in R, A, Γ, E, M9, E2, Vp2, H, C, B, Δ, Vp3 (Vaticano-Palatinus 127), Vb1 (Barberinianus I, 45), and (vs. 691-930) Rm1 (Vallicellianus F 16). The last-named is a copy of the Aldine edition, and has for us no interest. Vb1 is a copy of Γ, while M9 and E2 are derived from E, and Δ from B, as in the *Aves*; these will be mentioned therefore only when they differ from the parent Mss. A, Γ, and E constitute one family. H and Vp2 may here, as in the *Aves*, be represented by the single symbol *h*; C, however, is closely connected in the *Acharnenses* with Vp3 (symbol for the two *c*). For proof of these various relations see *Harvard Studies in Classical Philol.* XVIII (1907), 157 ff.

each, however, was connected with the text by an appropriate *signum*, there was slight excuse for the mistake on the part of Victorius. In B, 1107 and 1119 follow 1097 in the text, but were expunged by the original scribe, and later crossed out by B².

Textual variants found in Γ and other Mss. — 98 ἐ(πέμψε) Vict., ἐπεμψε Γ²c] ἀπέπεμψε(ν) RAGE, ἔκπεμψε hB, ἀπέμψε Ald. 99 ψευδαρτάβα] ψευδατάρβα E2, ψευδαρσώβα Ald. 109 μέγας] μόγας Ald. 112 σαρδανιακόν] σαρδιανικόν RE, σαρψεινιακόν Ald. 134 θέωρος (E)] θέωρ' hAld., om. RE²B 363 φρονεῖς] φονεῖς Ald. 408 ἐκκυκλήσει τι] ἐκκυκλήθητι Rc, ἐκκυκλήθητ' hBAld. 510 καὶ τοῖς (Γ²)] καὶ τὸς AGEhcBAld. 522 ἀπέπραχθ' (B²)] ἀπέπραθ' Rhc, ἀπέπρατ' EAld., καὶ πέπρατ' B 571 ἔχομαι] ἴσχομαι hBAld. 633 φησίν] φησί M9c, φασί hAld. 665 φλεγυρά] βδελυρά h, φλεγυρόν Ald. 766 παχεῖα καὶ καλά] παχεῖαι καὶ καλαί hBAld. 891 τέκν'] τέν' Ald. 1022 ἐπετρίβην¹] ἐπετρίβόμην R, ἐπετρίβειν Ald. 1168 λαβεῖν] βαλεῖν AEhcAld. 1208 κινεῖς] κυνεῖς RVp2cAld. 1221 σκοτοβινῶ (Γ²)] σκοτοδινῶ BALD., vs. om. AGE. Verse 152 was to be supplied from any of our Mss, but none of them reads *περὶ* before *τῶν παρνόπων*; this must be attributed to the carelessness of Victorius.

Assignments of verses common to Γ and other Mss. — 101 ΠΡΕΣΒ. Η ΚΗ.] — RA, ΚΗ. E2hBcor., ΠΡ. cB 104 ΨΕΥΔΑΡ.] — RA, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΟΦΘΑΛΜΟΣ c, om. hAld. 203 ΑΜΦΙ.] ΔΙ. hAld., om. A 296 ΔΙ.] — RA, om. Ald. 297 ΧΟ.] — A, om. Ald. 1098² ΔΙ. (Γ²)] ΛΑΜ. ΓEAld., om. RA(?)hc 1099 ΛΑ.] om. RAM9E2hc Ald. 1101 ΛΑ.] — RA, ΔΙ. hc, om. Ald. 1208^b ΔΙ. (E)] — RA, ΛΑ. E²hc Ald. Cf. 1209^b ΛΑ. Vict., : ΓR] ΔΙ. EhcAld., sp. B, om. AVb1; also 100 ΨΕΥΔΑΡΤΑΒΑΣ] ΨΕΥΔΑΡΤΑΣ Γ (but Ψευδαρτά-^{ΔΤ'}βας in text 99)] — RA, ΨΕΥ E, ΨΕΥΔ(A)ΤΑΡΒ E2, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΟΦΘΑΛΜΟΣ c, om. hAld.

There is but a single place where the correction of Victorius fails to appear in Γ: 432 ΕΤ.] — A, om. ΓEAld. But the aid of no Ms was required to make this obvious correction.

Gloss found in Γ only. — 1233 ἐν εἰσθέσει ἱαμβοὶ δίμετροι ἀκατάληκτοι.

*Glosses found in Γ and other Mss.*³ — 83 συνήρμοσεν] om. Vb1

¹ Victorius simply wrote η over ἐπετρίβειν of the Aldine (Freeman). Nickel errs in attributing ἐπετρίβειν to Aldus.

² ΛΑ. (1097) and ΔΙ. (1100) required no change, being the same in Γ and the Aldine.

³ Vb1 contains many of the interlinear glosses of Γ; Vp3 has no glosses. For Vp2 see next note.

564 ἀντὶ τοῦ τύψεις] τύψεις RM9 577 κακῶς ἀγορεύει] κ. ἀπαγορεύει R
 798 ἀντὶ τοῦ τὸν ποσειδῶ] μὰ τὸν π. M9, om. R 815 παρέλκεται (τὸ
 σοὶ παρέλκεται ΓRE)] om. Vb1 827 τοὺς παρὰ τὸν μεγαρέα] τ. περὶ
 τ. μεγαρικόν ΓΕ, τούτους τ. περὶ τ. μεγαρικόν R, om. Vb1 905 τοὺς
 θεοὺς] om. RVb1 912 ἡδίκημένος] τί ἦ. R, om. Vb1M9 1007 πῆξω,
 κεντήσω] om. RM9 1099 ἐκ θυμῶν κατασκευασθέντας] om. Vb1E1 199
 ὥσεί ἔλεγε μῆλα, ὅτι παρὰ τὰ ἄλλα σκληρότερα εἰσιν] ὥσεί ἔλεγεν . . .
 σκληρώτερα ἐστίν R, om. Vb1E 1223 ταῖς ὑγιειναῖς, ταῖς θεραπει-
 καῖς] τ. θ. R, om. E 1225 ὡς νικήσας τὸν ἄθλον αἰτεῖ τὸν ἄσκόν]
 om. E.

The following glosses of Victorius were excerpted from the scholia :
 1 κατὰ τὴν] κατὰ (gl.) M9, om. Vb1 132 τῇ γυναικί¹] om. Vb1M9
 436 λείπει ποιήσον] om. RVb1 625 λείπει τὸ ἰόντας] om. Vb1M9
 684 τὸ σκότος] om. Vb1 704 ἀγριότητι.] om. Vb1. These explanations
 are all to be found in the Aldine scholia. In two instances Victorius
 seems to have emended his text in accordance with the interpre-
 tation of the scholiast: 493 ὦν inserted after εἰς 697 ἐν inserted
 before Μαρθῶνι. In the first instance the gloss reads λείπει (λέγε-
 ται Γ) τὸ ὦν, ἢ εἰς ὦν RΓEAld., while M9 has simply ὦν over εἰς.
 In the second place M9 has simply ἐν, while ΓEAld. have λείπει ἢ ἐν,
 οἶον (om. E) ἐν Μαρθῶνι.²

Corrections of scholia derivable from Γ and other Mss.—53 διὸ εἰ-
 ρήνης ἐπιθυμῶ] om. Vb1EAld. 1176 κηρωτὴν and ἐμπλαστρον φάρμακον]
 κ. δὲ ἕ. φ. ΓΕ, κ. δὲ ἕ. M9, om. RAld. 1177 τὸ λεπρὸν χειρίδιον]
 λεπτὸν χ. Γ, τ. λεπτὸν (λεπρὸν Ald.) χοιρίδιον EAld., om. RVb1 τὴν
 ὀρεγκα] τὴν ἄρεγκα Γ, τὸν νάρεγκα E, τὸν νάρεγκα Ald., om. RVb1.

All the other glosses given by Victorius could have been
 taken from Hesychius or Suidas, with two exceptions: 683
 τῇ πυνκί, 748 ἡγουν κηρύσσω. These are to be found in none
 of our Mss, and presumably therefore were either invented
 by Victorius or transferred here from their original context.³

¹ Thus as a gloss in Vp2, which contains scattering scholia on the first two hundred verses.

² It must be admitted that these two instances taken in connection with the gloss on vs. 1 suggest for the moment the possible use of M9 by Victorius. Yet in view of the lack of confirmatory evidence elsewhere these agreements in the *Acharnenses* must be looked upon as quite fortuitous.

³ πορνῶν (529) was either anticipated from 537 (πόρνας ΓΕ) or came from Suidas (s.v. λαικαστής); παρ' ὑπόνοιαν (733) is evidently nothing but a variation upon παρὰ προσδοκίαν of the scholium as given by Aldus and ΓRE.

Vespae. — For this play I have been able to consult facsimiles of R, V, and Γ; the only other Ms containing scholia is G, the copy of V. For the scholia and glosses, therefore, my material is virtually complete; for the text I must content myself with showing that for vs. 421–1537 Victorius could have secured all but one of his readings from Γ, whereas many of them do not appear in R or V.

Textual variants found in Γ, but not in R or V. — 430 εἶα εἶα] εἶα εἶα νῦν R, εἶα εἶα νῦν V, εἶα νῦν Ald. 498 αἰτεῖ γ'] αἰτεῖς RVAld. 595 φῆναι¹] φεῖναι RV, ἀφεῖναι Ald. 616 τόνδε κεκόσμημαι (Γ later changed to κεκόμισμαι)] τόνδ' ἐσσεκόμισμαι RVAld. 688 τρυφερωνθείς] τρυφερωνθείς RVAld. 901 ἐξαναστήσειν¹] ἐξαπατήσειν RVAld. 950 διαβεβλημένον] διαβεβλημένους RVAld. 1107 κατ' ἐσμούς] καθεσμούς RVAld. 1222 δέξει] δέξει RVAld. 1294 κατηγέψασθε] κατηρέψασθε V, κατηρίψασθε R², om. vs. R. In 1085 γρ. ἐσωζόμεσθα is taken literally from Γ, while V has ἐσωζόμεσθα in the text, R ἐπανσάμεσθα with no variant; 1023 παράξον occurs in the lemma of the scholium in Γ, while παρᾶξον is read in the text of ΓRVAld.²

Textual variants occurring (1) in ΓR. — 928 λόχημ (but γ crossed before μ in R)] λόχημ VAld. 1069 κικίννος] κίννος V, κοκκίνους Ald.; (2) in ΓRV. — 800 ἡκηκόειν] ἡκηκόεις Ald. 804 ὥσπερ] ὥπερ Ald. 890 τῶν γενναιοτέρων] τῶν νῦν γε σοῦ νεωτέρων Ald. 1081 ξὺν δουρὶ (ξυνδορὶ ΓRV)] δουρὶ Ald. 1083 στὰς ἀνὴρ] πᾶς ἀνὴρ Ald. 1127 ἐμπλήμενος] πεπλησμένος Ald. 1133 παῖδας] παῖδα Ald. 1206 βούπαις] βούταις Ald. 1248 δῆ] δὲ Ald.

The only variant offered by Victorius not to be found in Γ is 802 ἐνοικοδομήσει] ἀνοικοδομήσει ΓR, ἐνοικοδομήσει V, ἐνοικοδομέσει Ald. Probably he merely wrote η over ε in this place.³

¹ After the readings in vs. 595 and 901 Victorius has added the symbols *vc* (*sic*), apparently to denote two different Mss. It may be that the improbability of these readings caused him to look them up in a second Ms, of which he made little further use.

² Four changes in the assignment of verses to speakers (629^b–630 to BΔE., 1179 to BΔE., 1194^b–1195 to ΦΙΑ., 1252^b ff. to ΦΙΑ.) are based on Γ; only the last was indicated clearly in the other two Mss.

³ More than one of his corrections consisted of a single letter placed over the error; thus *Ach.* 98 ἀπέμψε^ε 1022 ἐπετριβεῖν^η (Freeman).

Glosses found in Γ alone.—437 κέντρον (ἐν κ. Γ) 439 τῶν οἰκετῶν
 442 δυϊκῶς τὸ τούτω, ἢ ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν 465 ὑπείσερχομένη ἢ τυραν-
 νίς 482 ὁ (om. Γ) ῥήτωρ 487 ὅστις ἐστάλης ἐπὶ τῷ τυραννήσῃ ἡμῶν
 510 εἰδός ἐστιν (om. Γ) ἰχθύων 596 οὐ δωροδοκεῖ 600 κύκλω περιψῆ
 603 κορέσθητι 609 παππίαν καλοῦσα 612 ἐν τρύφησον (ἐντρύφησον
 Γ) 614 γογγύσας· ἔστι δὲ ποιά φωνή 703 διὰ τί σε βούλονται εἶναι
 πένητα καὶ τούτων ἕνεκ' ἐρώσι (διατί σε εἶναι β. π. gl. Γ; text as Ald.
 except εἶνεκ' ἐρῶ σοι) 771 ἀνίσχη, ἀνατέλλῃ 904 συνηγορεῖν τῷ κυνί
 939 τὰ εἰς τὸ καίεσθαι ἐπιτήδεια (ἐπιτήδεια Γ) 999 συγνῶ (συγγνῶ Γ)
 1178 λείπει ἐτύπησεν (λ. τὸ ἐτύπησεν Γ) 1275 παιονικὸν μέτρον
 1283 τροχαῖκόν τοῦτο 1284 ὁμοίως παιονικόν.

Glosses found in Γ and V.—(a) Victorius identical with ΓV :
 471, 483, 508, 524, 606, 613, 617, 769 (first), 893, 956, 1276, 1286
 (second),¹ 1297; in 526 ΓV have more than Vict.; cf. 639 ἀντὶ τοῦ
 εἰπεῖν οἰκεῖν Vict.] δέον εἰπεῖν οἰκεῖν κτέ. ΓV Ald. (b) Vict. nearer to
 Γ than to V : 478 ἀντὶ τοῦ μὴ ἔχειν πατέρα Vict. Γ] ἀντὶ μὴ ἔχειν τὸν
 πατέρα V 486 ἀντὶ τοῦ ἕως λείψανόν μου ὑπολείπεται] om. ἀντὶ τοῦ V
 528 λείπει γενναῖος, ἐγκρατής] γενναῖοι ἐγκρατεῖς V 571 τῆς δίκης
 παρεκβάλλον] τ. δ. παραβάλλον V 769 λείπει δραχμὴν] λ. δ. ταύτης
 τῆς δίκης κτέ. V 1053 κοινὰς ἐπινοίας καὶ ὑποθέσεις] καινὰς ἐ. κ. ὑ. Γ,
 καινὰς ἐ. κ. ἐπιθέσεις V.

Only five of the notes occur in R, and then they are not so close
 to Victorius as is Γ: 892 οὐ συγχωρήσομεν ἐλθεῖν Vict. ΓV] οὐ σ.
 εἰσελθεῖν R 916 καθὼς δικαστὴς κυνώδης· πτωχὸς γάρ] κ. δ. καὶ κ. π.
 γ. R 961 ὡς γραπτὸν δεδοκός λόγον τοῦ ἀπολογουμένου κυνός] λόγον
 for λόγον ΓRV, but λόγον (ambiguous) Γ, λόγ' RV 975 τὸν γέροντα
 and ὡς πρὸς δικαστήριον ὁ λόγος Vict.] ὡς π. τὸ δ. ὁ λόγ' | τ. γ. Γ,
 ὡς π. τὸ δ. ὁλ' τ. | γ. R, ὡς π. τὸ δ. ὁ λ' τ. γ. V 983 ἤγουν κατὰ
 γνώμην ἐμήν] κ. γ. ἐ. Γ, ἀντὶ τοῦ κ. γ. ἐ. R, om. V.

Additions to scholia due to Γ.—610, 53 ποιά (after μάξα), and
 988, 7 τῷ (before ἐπειδή).

Corrections of scholia obtainable from Γ or V.—502 συνουσίας in
 place of συνομωσίας, 995 ἐλειποψύχησεν for ἐλυποψύχησεν.

We have thus found in Γ the only extant Ms from which
 Victorius could have secured all his notes on *Vesp.* 421–1537,
 —except such as are traceable to the lexicographers,—and
 likewise a Ms offering all the textual variants entered by him
 on that portion of the play.

¹ ἐλύπησεν is a gloss in ΓV.

The interesting question now arises whether the notes and variants on vs. 1-420 were derived from the lost folios of Γ. I confidently believe that they were. In the first place, it is very probable that the missing signatures of Γ were all lost at the same time;¹ and we have already seen that the *Aves* was found intact by Victorius. Again, his entries in the first third of the play are of the same frequency as in the later parts, and there is the same wide divergence from R and V throughout.

Of particular interest, then, will be the list of textual variants which Victorius has saved to us from the lost leaves of Γ: 5 *σμικρόν*² (RV) 36 *ύός* (R) 52 *όβολώ* (R, *όβολώ* V) 70 *γρ. καθείρξας* (κ. in text RV) 74 *προνάπους* (RV) 99 *ιδών* 108 *γρ. καὶ ἀναπεπλασμένος* (ἀ. in text RV) 156 *μαρώτατοι* (RV) 157 *δικάσοντα* (RV) 198 *κέκραχθαι* 232 *κρείττων* (R) 233 *κονδυλεύ* 343 *ὅτι λέγεις* (RV) 372 *ἐπιτηρώμεν* 395 *ἐγκεκύκλωται* (RV). There are also three changes in assignments: 143 BΔE. (O ΔE, sc. O ΔΕΣΠΙΟΤΗΣ V) 156 BΔE. 207 ΕΤΕΡΟΣ (— R); and vs. 365-366 are divided as three verses. Unfortunately there is here nothing of value not already known from R or V.

I add a list of the glosses on *Vesp.* 1-420 which are not to be found in R or V or in the lexicographers, and which may reasonably be assigned therefore to the lost folios of Γ:

116 *ὁ οἱ δικασταὶ φοροῦσιν* 121 *ἐπινοίαις* 170 *λείπει ἡ σύν* 178 *φυλαττόμενος ὑπ' ἐμοῦ δῆτα* 190 *ἄνευ θορύβου* 194 *λείπει τὸ γνώση με* 263 *ἤγουν ὁ Ζεὺς* 374 *ἀντὶ τοῦ δηχθῆναι καὶ λυπηθῆναι, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐκφυγεῖν σώσαντα τὴν καρδίαν* 385 *βού-*

¹ The *terminus post quem* for the loss of these signatures can be fixed as late as the beginning of the sixteenth century quite independently of the argument afforded by Victorius' use of them. The unusual enumeration of the folios as *ὀρθὸς α', ὀρθὸς β',* etc., was made, as is well known, while the Ms was still intact: the folios now in Leiden show these numbers in both plays, while the first extant folio of the *Vespae* is numbered *σφη· ζ*. In the *Harvard Studies*, XVIII (1907), p. 187 ff., I endeavor to show that the hand which entered these numbers, as well as certain other directions and occasional corrections, was identical with the correcting hand of B; that B and Γ were compared and borrowings made in both directions. But B is assigned by all palaeographers to the sixteenth century.

² This, and not *οὐ μικρόν*, is the entry of Victorius, according to Mr. Freeman.

λεται εἰπεῖν τι αὐτοῖς and ἀντὶ τοῦ οἴδατε τί ποιήσατε 390
τῶν κατηγορουμένων¹ 400 ἔπ' ἔτος.

Seventeen other glosses given by Victorius on these four hundred verses, together with one change in a scholium, are to be found more or less exactly in V², while one or two occur in R³; all of these presumably were in Γ.

Other plays. — To be complete, my investigation ought properly to include the notes of Victorius on the other plays contained in Γ; but the only one of these on which the notes are sufficient to furnish much of a criterion is the *Equites*. For this play, however, I did not have at my disposal any adequate material; nor did it seem probable that I should soon be in a position to prove that none of the other twenty-seven Mss containing that play agree as closely as Γ with Victorius. I may state, however, regarding these other plays that a comparison of Victorius' excerpts with the printed collations leads to the belief that Γ was the source used for the *Equites*, for the single addition to the text in the *Ecclesiastusae*,⁴ and likewise for the rare notes on the *Pax*,⁵ if we except the lacunae at the end, which were clearly supplied from some other source, inasmuch as Γ never contained these verses. The *Lysistrata* is not in the Aldine, and accordingly there are no entries for that play in the collections edited by Nickel. Nevertheless Victorius did excerpt a few readings of that play from Γ, and entered them in his copy of the first printed *Lysistrata*, published in 1515. Enger,⁶ who is here my authority, cites only about a dozen variants all told; but these suffice to prove his claim.

¹ Similarly Γ has κατηγορούμενον as gloss to φεύγοντ' in 1000.

² In eight instances V agrees exactly with Vict.: vs. 38, 102, 179, 192, 216, 224, 227, 411; in vs. 219 there is essential agreement; in vs. 34, 39, 217, 222, 223, 364, 389, 412, 416 there are noteworthy differences.

³ Vs. 38 and (in part) vs. 227.

⁴ Vs. 469-470, omitted in the Aldine.

⁵ The nine readings on vs. 378-947 are all to be found in Γ, most of them in R and V as well. The note on 117 is from Hesych. R, V, and G are the only extant Mss containing vs. 948-1011 and 1355-1356. Either R or a careless copy of R may have been Victorius' source for these verses; he agrees with R oftenest, yet has two or three errors not in that Ms.

⁶ *Lysistrata* (1844), p. xiv.

Our identification of Γ as the source of Victorius' glosses on several plays affords an interesting insight into the methods pursued by Dindorf in the compilation of the scholia. After saying of Γ that it nowhere furnishes anything of value not to be found in R or V,¹ and after characterizing these notes of Victorius as "magnae testes inopiae,"² he nevertheless showed such a readiness to receive them into his edition that he often failed to reject those which are manifestly derived from Hesychius³ or Suidas;⁴ while good glosses which might have been added from Γ were overlooked. That he was essentially right, however, in his estimate of the value of these Victorian glosses must be apparent to anybody who has examined them even casually. They seem to be for the most part the trivial comment of some Byzantine *sciulus*, and this is particularly true of the glosses on the *Aves* peculiar to Γ . The question which of these glosses are to be admitted into future editions of the scholia will be decided no longer on the basis of the capricious selection made by Victorius, but by the attitude the editor assumes toward whole classes of glosses in Γ .

An important result of this investigation is the light it throws upon the history of Γ . That this Ms has been in the Laurentian ever since the dedication of the library building in 1571, has been argued from the binding; but of its history during the two preceding centuries virtually nothing has been known. Thanks now to the statement of Victorius, we learn that in his day it had belonged to the *bibliotheca Divi Marci*, or the library of San Marco in Florence.⁵ This

¹ Preface to scholia, p. vi.

² *Ibid.*, p. xi.

³ Thus *Av.* 582, 1183, 1240, 1338, 1500, 1520, 1662, 1717, 1739; *Ach.* 72 (twice), 101, 171, 255, 320, 392, 423, 452, 463, 616, 841, 874, 975, 1014, 1156, 1188.

⁴ *Av.* 169; *Ach.* 411, 554, 668, 691, 695, 703.

⁵ That the expression *bibliotheca Divi Marci*, so frequently employed by Victorius without further qualification, should have been used of a library outside of his native Florence, is in itself sufficiently improbable. Moreover, there are instances in which he definitely describes the library as being *apud nos*; so in his *Variae Lect.* V, xxi. For further proof see Bandini, *Catalogus Codicum Lat. Bibl. Med. Laur.* IV, pp. xxxv-xxxix, where we learn some of the terms used by

library, from which Victorius borrowed so many Mss for purposes of collation, would appear to have declined notably in importance during his lifetime. The various vicissitudes of the famous Laurentian Aeschylus, known to have belonged to the library of San Marco *ca.* 1500, and to have been in its present home since 1589,¹ could doubtless be paralleled in the history of numerous other Mss, including Γ, which at one time or another during that century found their way from the convent into the Laurentian. Of particular interest are the words of Victorius, written in 1536:² “Quaedam (*sc. exemplaria*) . . . sunt in nobili illa et nunquam satis laudata Mediceae familiae bibliotheca, . . . quae etsi nondum explicata est, studiosorum tamen commodis privatim servit. Reliqua vero in Divi Marci altera non minus priscis voluminibus referta, quae omnibus omni tempore patet.” This statement shows conclusively that the Mss sold by the Dominicans in 1508 to Cardinal Giovanni de’ Medici must have been largely if not entirely from the private Medicean collection, which had been housed in the convent much of the time between 1494 and that year. That it was the private collection alone which was sold is definitely stated by a contemporary chronicler of San Marco, who writes:³ “Quo etiam anno 1508 . . . decreverunt tandem prior et patres discreti e nobilissima Medicorum bibliotheca huiusmodi pecunias extrahere, quam nuper pretio trium milium ducatorum a syndicis rebellium . . . comparaverat conventus noster.” It is certainly significant that the catalogues of the private library

Politian of this same library, among them *Publica Medice gentis bibliotheca*, *bibliotheca Marciana*, and *Divi Marci Florentina bibliotheca*.

¹ See Rostagno, *L' Eschilo Laurenziano*, pref. p. 9 ff. In a *Repertorium sive index librorum latinae et graecae bibliothecae conventus sancti Marci de florentia ordinis Praedicatorum*, dating from *ca.* 1500, he finds catalogued about 175 Greek and 1000 Latin Mss, several of which he identifies with Mss long in the Laurentian.

² In his *Explicationes suarum in Ciceronem castigationum*, first postscript *ad lectorem*.

³ In the *Annalia Conventus S. Marci*, a Ms preserved in the Biblioteca del Museo di S. Marco. I quote from the excerpts published by Piccolomini, *Delle condizioni e delle vicende della Libreria Medicea privata dal 1494 al 1508*, in *Archivio Storico Italiano*, XIX (1874), p. 256 f.

of the Medici dating from the years 1456, 1495, and *ca.* 1535,¹ contain no trace of a Ms answering to the description of Γ ; we thus have at least negative evidence of the correctness of Victorius' statement regarding the ownership of Γ in his day.

It now remains to determine as accurately as possible the period in Victorius' long career when he made this partial collation of Γ . Unfortunately we have here no definite data² to guide us, and we must accordingly fall back on certain rather general considerations. The internal evidence afforded by these notes points very strongly, it seems to me, to an early period in Victorius' life. Not much of an argument, perhaps, can be derived from the caprice with which he now selects absurd readings and glosses, now overlooks excellent ones.³ But his carelessness in recording some of the glosses and variants⁴ is certainly such as to suggest immaturity.

¹ See Piccolomini, *l.c.*, XX (1874), p. 51 ff., XXI (1875), p. 106 ff., and the *Index Bibliothecae Mediceae* (Libreria Dante, No. 2, 1885).

² None of the editions used by him, whether of the comic poet or of the lexicographers, was apparently later than 1515.

³ Of the readings in Γ which ought certainly to have been recognized by Victorius as superior to those of the Aldine text, he has noted approximately one-third in the *Aves* and *Ach.*, the two plays I have examined in this respect. And if we include the other readings of Γ which have been accepted by modern scholars, we shall find that but one good reading in five was recognized by Victorius when he saw it; for we are not justified in supposing that he consulted Γ simply for various *crucēs* he had marked in his Aldine copy, in view of his express words at the end of the *Aves*, "cum quo totam comoediam contulimus." Among the serious errors of the Aldine left uncorrected by Victorius may be noted the following, from the first seven hundred verses of the *Aves*: 27 om. οὐν 83 om. αὐτόν 298 πηνέοψ 472 κορυδὸς 517 οὐν ἐνεκα 521 τις τί 539 om. XO. 559 ἐπίλωσι βάλλειν 595 ὥστ' οὐκ 602 πολλῶ 608 προσθήσου 622 ἐαυτοῖς 649 γε νῶν ὅπως 658 λέγων and ἄγω 659 ἀρστησον, omitting εἶ. On the other hand, he has noted a number of readings more freakish than plausible; e.g.: *Av.* 566 καθαγιάζειν 853 σεμνά added 1681 εἰ μὴ ὀρνιθιάζειν 1748 φάνος *Vesp.* 595 φῆναι 616 τόνδε κεκόσμημαι 901 ἐξαναστήσειν 1294 κατηγήσασθε. The scholium on *Aves* 798 and the gloss on *Aves* 1718 are good illustrations of the absurdity of some of the notes recorded by Victorius.

⁴ In the gloss on *Av.* 276 he overlooked ὁ ἐν, which in Γ is slightly separated from the other words and moreover not very distinct; in the scholium on 778 he writes κατακηρουμένη (confirmed by Mr. Freeman) in place of κατακλουμένη of Γ ; cf. also 1667 συνεπέλθῃ Vict.] ἀναπέλθῃ Γ *Vespae* 1053 κοινὰς] καινὰς and his confusion of the two glosses on *Aves* 1365. In adding vs. 152 of the *Acharnenses*

This conclusion receives some confirmation when we compare the collation of the Ms of Varro, *de Ling. Lat.* (now Laurent. 51, 10), which Victorius and his friend Jacopo da Diaceto made in 1521.¹ Notwithstanding the claim of minute accuracy put forward for this collation, recent scholars have discovered in it numerous errors.² That Victorius was, however, a precocious youth is abundantly testified. An edition of Lascaris' Grammar was dedicated to him by Bernardo Giunta in 1515,³ when he was but sixteen years of age; and four years later Francinus, in dedicating to him his edition of Pomponius Mela, used these words: "humanissime Petre . . . praesertim cum ipse utrumque fontem, tam graecum quam latinum (non ut plerique omnes faciunt iuvenes hac nostra tempestate . . .) summis, ut aiunt, labiis degustasti, at toto te corpore proluisti."⁴ We learn, furthermore, that even before the age of fifteen, when he went to Pisa for his intended university course, he had resorted with two other youths to one Giorgio Riescio da Poggibonsi, a blind professor of Greek, for assistance in reading Aristophanes.⁵ Comparing this anecdote with Victorius' own statement,⁶ in

he inserted a superfluous *περι* before *τῶν*; and he was deceived at first by the position, in the margin of Γ, of vs. 1107 of that same play. Due perhaps to deliberate emendation are *Aves* 1245 *καὶ φόβον ἐμβάλλειν* Vict.] *εἰς φ. ε. Γ* and 1582 *ἐπιτρυβε]* *σύντρυβε ἐπιβαλλε*.

¹ See Spengel's Varro, *de Ling. Lat.*, 1885, p. iii. The collators' statement reads: "Petrus Victorius ac Iacobus Diacetus contulimus cum vetusto codice ex Divi Marci bibliotheca litteris longobardis exarato tanta diligentia seu potius morosa observatione ut vel quae in eo corrupte legebantur in hunc transtulerimus. Die XIII Aprilis MDXXI." This Diaceto was a boyhood friend of Victorius (see W. Rüdiger, *Petrus Victorius aus Florenz*, 1896, p. 4), and one naturally wonders whether he may not have had a share in the collation of Γ as well. The expression at the end of the *Aves* is *contulimus*, which in a book not designed for the public eye would seem hardly called for if Victorius were speaking of himself only. I am unable to cite parallels for *contuli* from Victorius himself, but that was the form used by Politian (see Bandini, *op. cit.*, p. xxxvi f.).

² Spengel, *op. cit.*, p. iii ff.

³ On the authority of Bandini, *Iuntarum Typographiae Annales* (Lucca, 1791), II, p. 97.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 136 f.

⁵ Rüdiger, *l.c.*, p. 3, on the authority of Salviati and Francesco Vettori.

⁶ "Fere enim semper quaecunque maiore studio legi, morem habui cum vetustis exemplaribus conferre." — Epist. i, p. 14.

1540, that he had nearly always followed the practice of comparing the text of those authors in whom he became particularly interested with Mss, I feel confident that we shall not be far amiss in dating his work on Aristophanes *ca.* 1520, with a possible margin of five years on either side.¹

When and under what circumstances Γ left the library of San Marco can be determined only in the light of new evidence. Those who have touched hitherto on the question of the disappearance of various Mss from that library at this period have generally proceeded on the assumption that the means employed were not the most honorable; and 1499, *ca.* 1519, and 1545 have been suggested as probable dates for the abstraction of Mss from the convent.² As regards the first two of these occasions, it may be urged that if there had been any wholesale pillaging then for which restitution was never made, Victorius would hardly have been able to speak so highly of the library in 1536.³ We have his statement that the Ms of Varro, *de Ling. Lat.*, was in San Marco as late as 1553;⁴ the Aeschylus, however, appears to have been in private hands at that time.⁵ It is quite possible, therefore, that the various Mss disappeared from the convent singly or a few at a time during the course of several decades. The present condition of Γ certainly lends some color to the theory of rough handling in the process of removal to its present home.

¹ His activity in the political conflicts of his native city during the three years following 1527 (see Rüdiger, *l.c.*, pp. 9-15), argues against that period as the time of his use of Γ.

² For the first two dates see Bandini, *op. cit.*, IV, p. xxxvi f.; the last date is suggested by Rostagno, *l.c.*, p. 10, n. 1.

³ See above, p. 213.

⁴ In his *Variae Lect.* (1553), V, xxi. The wording remains unchanged in the edition of 1582, but this may have been an oversight.

⁵ Rostagno, *l.c.*, p. 10.